



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,174	08/07/2003	Petre Dini	50325-0780	2931
29989 7590 06/22/2007 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/637,174

Applicant(s)

DINI ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-47 are subject to examination.

#### *Specification*

- 2.. The disclosure is objected. Some of the informalities are:
  - i. “Background of the Invention” section: the paragraph 2 of the specification is **not** the background of the invention, and the applicant is requested to remove the paragraph. In fact, the applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide information and/or prior arts that have led to the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title, “approaches for capturing illegal and undesired behavior ....” is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter. “Approaches for” is not allowed. “Illegal and undesired behavior” is subjective and it is not apparent of “what” the behavior is about.

4. The abstract is objected. A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an

Art Unit: 2154

improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative. The abstract fails to show “of what” the state and state transition is; what is illegal versus legal, what is undesired versus desired, claimed threshold, polling, authorization violation, forgery, non-graceful QoS degradation, etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Drawings***

5. The figures submitted on 8/7/03 are objected to. New corrected drawings are required in this application because the figures do not show “of what” the state and state transition is, the claimed, threshold, polling, authorization violation, forgery, non-graceful QoS degradation, etc. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled --Replacement Sheet-- in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. An initialed and dated copy of the applicant's IDS form 1449, paper dated 11/24/2003, is attached to the instant Office action.

***Claim Objections***

7. Claims 30-47 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
Claims 30-47 mentions, "A computer-", which should be --The computer---  
Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claims 1-19 and 29-47 contain usage of conditional "if" (statements) for the limitations and since the "if" conditional statement(s) contains condition that is meet or not meet, the following steps/limitations of the "if" statement(s) do not exist when the condition is not meet. The claims do not produce useful and concrete and tangible results. Also,

Art Unit: 2154

the claims 20 and 27 and their dependent claims do not contain components that are not limited to hardware. Also, claims 29-47 do not contain computer storage medium such as memory

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) "of what" the state and state transition is; 2) what is illegal versus legal 3) what is undesired versus desired 4) "of what" the behavior is 5) specifying of both what is legal and what is illegal 6) specifying of both what is undesired and what is desired 7) steps that perform the capturing of the claimed capturing. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the claimed capturing by just specifying as claimed.

The term " illegal and undesired behavior " in claims 1-47 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. It is not apparent what is illegal versus not illegal and undesired versus desired.

The term "nongracefully" in claims 16 and 44 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. It is not apparent what is nongracefully versus not gracefully.

Claims 1-19 and 29-47 contain "a said state" which are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim. It is not apparent whether the state is new (another) state or the state already presented in the claim.

Claims 5 and 33 recite the claimed limitations contain "if" statement without mentioning what is done when the "if" condition is considered and hence these limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim.

Claims 11 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) "of what" the illegal states are to be specified. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the specifying.

Claims 12 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) "of what" the undesired states are to be specified. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the specifying.

Claims 13 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements,

such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” the illegal states and undesired states are to be specified. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the specifying.

Claims 15 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” the authorization violation and of what the authentication forgery is. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the specifying.

Claims 16 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” the QoS degradataion is. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the specifying.

Claims 17 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” the trends are. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the examining.

Claims 18 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements,



Art Unit: 2154

such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” the state-behavior is and of what the threshold value is. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the examining.

Claims 19 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: 1) “of what” increases or decreases is of what the threshold value is. Without these it is not possible to accomplish the examining.

Claims 20-26 recite the limitations, “the occurrence”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)).

Note: Examiner has made an effort to locate the limitations from the claims that are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The applicant is requested to fix similar limitations, which the examiner might have overlooked, from the claims including other groups of claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kirti et al., 7,7076,543 (Hereinafter Kirti).

12. Referring to claim 1, Kirti discloses a method for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 4) comprising: specifying state and state transitions for a component (e.g., col., 8), wherein specifying includes specifying composite state transition (e.g., col., 7); and if a said state occurs, generating a notification corresponding to the specified state (e.g., col., 7).

13. Referring to claim 2, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein said states are specified based on thresholds (e.g., col., 5).

14. Referring to claim 3, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the notification is an event (e.g., col., 4).

15. Referring to claim 4, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein a state is a state of a component (e.g., col., 4), and wherein the step of generating the notification comprises generating the notification by the component (e.g., col., 4).

16. Referring to claim 5, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein if the state relates to an interaction between components (e.g., col., 4), and wherein the notification is generated by a component involved in the interaction between the components (e.g., col., 4).

17. Referring to claim 6, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses reporting the notification to a network management system (e.g., col., 5).

18. Referring to claim 7, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses detecting whether a state has occurred (e.g., col., 5); and wherein if said step of detecting detects that a state has occurred, said notification is generated in response to said step of detecting (e.g., col., 5).

19. Referring to claim 8, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses the step of detecting is performed by an agent (e.g., col., 4).

20. Referring to claim 9, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses the agent is a dedicated agent (e.g., col., 4).

21. Referring to claim 10, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses polling said components to determine whether a state or state transition has occurred (e.g., col., 7).

22. Referring to claim 11, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying illegal states (e.g., col., 6).

23. Referring to claim 12, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

24. Referring to claim 13, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying illegal states and undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

25. Referring to claim 14, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein detecting whether a state or state transition has occurred comprises determining whether a component or component interaction has entered an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

26. Referring to claim 15, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein an authorization violation and an authentication forgery are defined as illegal states (e.g., col., 6).

Art Unit: 2154

27. Referring to claim 16, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein a nongracefully QoS degradation is defined as an undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

28. Referring to claim 17, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses examining multiple notifications to deduce trends regarding the network (e.g., col., 6).

29. Referring to claim 18, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for stable-behavior in a threshold value (e.g., col., 6).

30. Referring to claim 19, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for increases or decreases in a threshold value (e.g., col., 6).

31. Referring to claims 29 through 47, please refer to the rejections of the above-rejected claims 1-19 for the rejections and the references. Kirti also discloses a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components, which instructions, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to carry out the steps.

32. Referring to claim 20, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

Art Unit: 2154

a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 4), the system comprising: a network component configured to spontaneously generate notifications upon the occurrence of specified states and state transitions (e.g., col., 7), including composite state transition (e.g., col., 7); and a network management system configured to receive said spontaneously generated notifications (e.g., col., 8).

33. Referring to claim 21, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses an agent configured to detect the generation of notifications by the network components (e.g., col., 4), and configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g., col., 4)

34. Referring to claim 22, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses a state table configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 4).

35. Referring to claim 23, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the state table is in a network management system (e.g., col., 4).

36. Referring to claim 24, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the state table is in a network component (e.g., col., 4).

Art Unit: 2154

37. Referring to claim 25, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine condition of a network component and to query the state table to determine whether the condition represents an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 4).

38. Referring to claim 26, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine a transition relating to a network component and to query the state table to determine whether the transition represents an illegal or undesired transition (e.g., col., 5).

39. Referring to claim 27, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 4) comprising: a network component; an agent configured to examine said network components to determine whether specified states, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 7), have occurred, wherein the agent is configured to generate notifications upon a determination that a specified state has occurred (e.g., col., 4), and wherein the agent is configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g., col., 4); and a network management system configured to receive reports of said generated notifications (e.g., col., 8).

40. Referring to claim 28, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

a state log configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 6).

41. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moran et al., 6,801,940 (Hereinafter Moran).

42. Referring to claim 1, Moran discloses a method for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2) comprising: specifying state and state transitions for a component (e.g., col., 5), wherein specifying includes specifying composite state transition; and if a said state occurs (e.g., col., 5), generating a notification corresponding to the specified state (e.g., col., 6).

43. Referring to claim 2, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein said states are specified based on thresholds (e.g. col., 6).

44. Referring to claim 3, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the notification is an event (e.g., col., 17).

45. Referring to claim 4, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein a state is a state of a component (e.g., col., 18), and wherein the step of generating the notification comprises generating the notification by the component (e.g., col., 18).



46. Referring to claim 5, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein if the state relates to an interaction between components (e.g., col., 19), and wherein the notification is generated by a component involved in the interaction between the components (e.g., col., 19).

47. Referring to claim 6, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses reporting the notification to a network management system (e.g., col., 21).

48. Referring to claim 7, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses detecting whether a state has occurred (e.g. col., 22); and wherein if said step of detecting detects that a state has occurred, said notification is generated in response to said step of detecting (e.g., col., 22).

49. Referring to claim 8, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses the step of detecting is performed by an agent (e.g., col., 44).

50. Referring to claim 9, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses the agent is a dedicated agent (e.g., col., 44).

Art Unit: 2154

51. Referring to claim 10, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses polling said components to determine whether a state or state transition has occurred (e.g., col., 44).

52. Referring to claim 11, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying illegal states (e.g., col., 46).

53. Referring to claim 12, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying undesired states (e.g., col., 46)

54. Referring to claim 13, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying illegal states and undesired states (e.g., col., 46)

55. Referring to claim 14, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein detecting whether a state or state transition has occurred comprises determining whether a component or component interaction has entered an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 46).

Art Unit: 2154

56. Referring to claim 15, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein an authorization violation and an authentication forgery are defined as illegal states (e.g., col., 46).

57. Referring to claim 16, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein a nongracefully QoS degradation is defined as an undesired state (e.g., table 2).

58. Referring to claim 17, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses examining multiple notifications to deduce trends regarding the network (e.g., col., 45).

59. Referring to claim 18, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for stable-behavior in a threshold value (e.g., col., 45).

60. Referring to claim 19, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for increases or decreases in a threshold value (e.g., col., 45).

61. Referring to claims 29 through 47, please refer to the rejections of the above-rejected claims 1-19 for the rejections and the references. Moran also discloses a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for capturing illegal and undesired

Art Unit: 2154

behavior for network components and for interactions between components, which instructions, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to carry out the steps (e.g., col., 5).

62. Referring to claim 20, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2), the system comprising: a network component configured to spontaneously generate notifications upon the occurrence of specified states and state transitions (e.g., col., 5), including composite state transition; and a network management system configured to receive said spontaneously generated notifications (e.g., col., 6).

63. Referring to claim 21, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses an agent configured to detect the generation of notifications by the network components, and configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g., col., 17).

64. Referring to claim 22, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses a state table configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 44).

65. Referring to claim 23, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the state table is in a network management system (e.g., col., 44).

66. Referring to claim 24, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the state table is in a network component (e.g., col., 44).

67. Referring to claim 25, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine condition of a network component and to query the state table to determine whether the condition represents an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 44).

68. Referring to claim 26, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine a transition relating to a network component and to query the state table to determine whether the transition represents an illegal or undesired transition (e.g., col., 44).

69. Referring to claim 27, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2) comprising: a network component (e.g., col., 5); an agent configured to examine said network components to determine whether specified states (e.g., col., 17), including composite state transitions, have occurred, wherein the agent is configured to generate notifications upon a determination that a specified state has occurred (e.g., col., 6), and wherein the agent is configured to report detected notifications to said network

Art Unit: 2154

management system (e.g., col., 44); and a network management system configured to receive reports of said generated notifications (e.g., col., 44).

70. Referring to claim 28, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses a state log configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 44).

### *Conclusion*

71. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see the IDS arts, Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine SNMP Support Guide", #OL-3057-03, dated 7/29/03, (18 pgs); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine SNMP Support Guide for Release 3.0", #OL-3057-03, dated 3/20/03, (9 pgs); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco IOS Software Releases 12.0 S, SNMP Support for VPNs", dated 3/6/03, (pgs. 1-13); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco IOS Software Releases 12.0S, SNMP Notification Logging", dated 1/30/03, (pgs. 1-8); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine, Introduction to SNMP", dated 10/23/03, (pgs. 1-4), which are pertinent to the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

Art Unit: 2154

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

June 20, 2007